

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 2 are amended. Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 2 can be found on at least page 5, lines 4-21 and in Figures 1 - 4 of the application as originally filed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is presented herein.

Entry of Response Proper

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner as the Amendment merely clarifies the claimed features of the invention; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, Japanese Patent Application Publication No. S63-93530 to Yoshihiro et al. (Yoshihiro), in view of the RVDT-Based Draw Wire Position Transducer made by Firstmark Controls (<http://www.firstmarkcontrols.com/pmc0602.htm>) (hereinafter referred to as "Firstmark Control").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reason(s).

Claims 1 and 2 each recite, among other features, a second sensor which emits a pair of laser beams to form a detection area, and which includes a pair of light receivers which detect a location of a wire or wire member passing through the detection area. See the description of the claimed features on page 5, lines 4-21 and in Figures 1-4 of the application as originally filed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Yoshihiro fails to teach or suggest a sensor having a pair of light emitters which emit laser beams that form a detection area, as well as a pair of light receivers which detect a location of a wire within the detection area.

Firstmark Controls teaches a drawn wire positioning sensor which uses a transducer having a potentiometer which measures the movement of spring loaded cables, which are attached to various objects. The cables can be attached to moving objects and the potentiometer provides an analog voltage that is representative of the movement of the object, from which the location of the object to which the cable is attached may be determined.

However, Firstmark Controls, like Yoshihiro, fails to teach or suggest a sensor having a pair of light emitters which emit laser beams that form a detection area, as well as a pair of light receivers which detect a location of a wire within the detection area. Moreover, Applicants note Firstmark Controls notes that the transducers are susceptible to possible failure from corrosion, as well as wear and tear, thereby resulting in erroneous retraction of the cable among other undesirable results.

Applicants further note that the Yoshihiro and Firstmark Controls fail to teach or suggest modifying the systems taught therein to have sensors that use and/or include light emitters which emit lasers to form a detection area or zone or light receivers to determine the location of the object within the detection area.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 2 and assert Yoshihiro and Firstmark Controls fail to teach or suggest the invention recited by Claims 1 and 2.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 2 are not rendered obvious in view of the teachings of Yoshihiro and Firstmark Controls, either alone or in combination, as combining the teachings of the two references would never arrive at the invention recited by Claims 1 and 2.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit the Office Action has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness as required under M.P.E.P. §2143.03. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 1 and 2 are allowable for the above-described reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection, allowance of Claims 1 and 2, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing attorney docket number 028359-00004.**

Respectfully submitted,



Murat Ozgu
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810
MO/ayw